

From: Cope.Ben@epamail.epa.gov
Sent time: 07/06/2007 10:54:24 AM
To: Croxton.David@epamail.epa.gov; Gearheard.Mike@epamail.epa.gov; Psyk.Christine@epamail.epa.gov; Soscia.MaryLou@epamail.epa.gov; Palmer.John@epamail.epa.gov; Parkin.Richard@epamail.epa.gov; Mann.Laurie@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Grand Coulee TMDL

Columbia Temperature Team -

At the tail end of our last briefing on the Columbia/Snake TMDL, Marylou asserted her wish that we focus some effort on Grand Coulee as we move forward. Somebody, perhaps me, mused that we could do a TMDL/Implementation Plan just for Grand Coulee. Then the meeting ended. Dave Croxton and I were chatting later, and we think this idea merits consideration.

As we have emphasized all along, the top three players in temperature impact and control are Coulee, Dworshak, and Brownlee (Hells Canyon). Only one of these three, Dworshak, operates in a manner consistent with the goal of improving temperatures for fish. John Palmer and I are fully embarked on the Brownlee temperature control structure issue. Meanwhile, Coulee sits back and faces no requirements to implement changes in powerhouse operations, lost in the enormity of the 700 mile long, 15 dam Columbia TMDL.

The idea for your consideration is to do a TMDL analysis for the Columbia mainstem from Canadian border to the Coulee tailrace. I suppose the state of Washington would issue it (we could help with tech support). 1 state, 1 affected party, 1 standard, 0 cumulative impacts, and a possibility of meaningful improvements.

Thoughts?

-BC

Ben Cope, Environmental Engineer
Office of Environmental Assessment
EPA Region 10
Seattle, Washington
206-553-1442